

REMARKS

The Office action indicates that a restriction to one of the following claim groups is required:

- (I) claims 1-26, drawn to a user interface for a force reflecting haptic interface;
- (II) claims 27-35, drawn to a docking station for a force reflecting haptic interface device;
- (III) claims 36-47, drawn to driving of a force haptic interface device; and
- (IV) claims 48-51, drawn to monitoring an internal temperature of a force reflecting haptic interface.

Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group I (*i.e.*, claims 1-26). Applicants reserve the right to file one or more divisional application(s) directed to the subject matter of the non-elected claims present in the application. Applicants respectfully submit that this restriction requirement has been issued in error and respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal.

In response to a first restriction requirement issued in this application by Office action mailed on October 4, 2006, Applicants timely responded by electing Group I (*i.e.*, claims 1-19). At that time, Applicants also amended claims 20, 27-35, 36, and 48, and cancelled claims 52-53, without prejudice. As a result, solely claim 1 is independent and all of pending dependent claims 2-51 depend, either directly or indirectly, from elected independent claim 1.

The instant Office action now classifies certain dependent claims of independent claim 1 as being drawn to different inventions that are unrelated, since “they do not have to be used together since they have different modes of operation drawn to different aspects of the invention.” The Office action further states that “there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

As a threshold matter, insofar as there is solely a single independent claim (i.e., claim 1), and all dependent claims include all of the limitations of independent claim 1, all of the claims are necessarily related, as a matter of law.

Further, as the claims are presently structured, any differences between the subject matter of the claims (as grouped by the examiner) are used together. Accordingly, there is no reasonable basis for the proposition that there would be a "serious burden" on the examiner if restriction is not required, since examination and allowance of claim 1 necessarily entails allowance of all claims depending therefrom, as a matter of law.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the instant restriction requirement are respectfully requested, and examination of pending claims 1-51 is invited.


CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request that the application now proceed promptly to examination with all of claims 1-51. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' attorney would expedite the allowance of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (617) 570-1267.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 9, 2007
Registration No. 35,370

Tel. No.: (617) 570-1267
Fax No.: (617) 523-1231
Customer No. 051414


Christopher W. Stamos
Attorney for Applicants
Goodwin | Procter LLP
Exchange Place
Boston, Massachusetts 02109